

2011 Proposed Language Pilot Test MDS 3.0 Section Q Final Report

Prepared by:
Dann Milne, Ph.D.
Health Policy Consulting
June 16, 2011

This report was prepared for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under a contract with New Editions Consulting for Money Follows the Person technical assistance activities. The assistance of Karen Snell, Michele Baker, MPH and Jodi Duke, MPH, CPH in data development and statistical analysis are gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily reflect those of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services or its project officers.

Pilot Study Limitations

The purpose of the pilot test was to obtain feedback about the proposed new language items in Section Q and opinions on its usage and comparisons to the current form and process by a few of the assessors using the assessment forms. The test was not designed to provide statistics from which generalizations to the entire population of nursing facility residents could be made. The sample of residents was not drawn on a random basis and the sample sizes are minute. Comparisons between States or facilities cannot be made based on these results.

Section Q Proposed Language Pilot Test

Executive Summary

Purpose of the Pilot Test

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) implemented a pilot test in six States in February 2011 to address resident, family, State, provider and stakeholder concerns regarding new Minimum Data Set 3.0 (MDS 3.0) Section Q items, which were implemented on October 1, 2010.

Background

States, associations and facilities raised important concerns including: 1) some individuals, such as those with cognitive impairments, Alzheimer's disease, dementia, or mental illness, may be upset by asking them if they want to return to the community; 2) the feasibility of discharge question might exclude many potential candidates from being given a choice of transitioning to community living; 3) there is a need to properly involve the family or guardian for residents who are unable to communicate their preferences; and 4) some language clarifications were also recommended. Before considering making any of the recommended changes to Section Q, CMS wanted to conduct a pilot test of the new items to examine their use in practice.

Study Design

Nine nursing facilities in six States participated in a pilot test during February 2011, completing both current Section Q items in Appendix 1 and proposed language Section Q items in Appendix 2 when a MDS 3.0 assessment was required. This included any Medicare Part A assessments for skilled nursing facility residents and admission, annual, quarterly, and significant change in status assessments for long stay residents. Nursing facility pilot study assessors also completed a follow-up survey to provide feedback on the new Section Q items.

Study Findings

1. The major finding of the pilot test was that by eliminating the determination of feasibility of discharge item (often done by the nursing facility assessor) (Item Q0400B in Appendix 1), many more residents were asked the key question, Q0500B "Do you want to talk with someone about the possibility of leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community?"
 - Using the current version of Section Q, 95 respondents (of the 503 assessed) were asked and answered the return to the community question, and 6 said yes. Using the proposed version and eliminating the skip pattern in which the assessor is asked whether "discharge to the community determined is feasible/not feasible" resulted in 330 more individuals being asked the question about wanting to talk with someone, and 74 more individuals answering the question (Q0500B) Yes.
2. A second major finding was that, using the new Section Q items, respondents would be less likely to be upset by being asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community if they were given the option to opt-out on future quarterly assessments.
 - 91 percent (10 of 11) of nursing facility assessors indicated that the pilot version was more effective at eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community. 73 percent (8 of 11) of nursing

facility assessors indicated that the proposed version with an opt-out mechanism (Q0550A in Appendix 2) works better than the judgment-about-feasibility approach in the current version.

- 73 percent (8 of 11) of nursing facility assessors felt the proposed version opt-out question (Q0550A) will reduce the number of residents who are currently not appropriate to be asked question Q0500B – Do you want to talk to someone about returning to the community.
 - 80 percent (8 of 10) of the nursing facility assessor survey respondents indicated the new version provides a better mechanism to not ask the Q0500B question (on quarterly assessments) if the resident, and/or family/guardian, does not want to be asked the question again.
3. Several language clarifications tested were found to be helpful.
- 45 percent of the assessors indicated that compared to the current Section Q version, the proposed language version was easier to understand and communicate to residents while 55 percent said it was the same, and none said it was harder.
 - The majority (78 percent of nursing facility assessors) also indicated that the language changes in the Referral item (Q0600) were clearer than the current version.

Recommendations

- I.** Eliminate current item Q0400B, “Was determination made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to the community is feasible?” because it removes the judgment-about-feasibility item and results in more individuals being asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community and in many more individuals saying yes to that question.
- II.** Replace Q0400B with a new item Q0550A, “Does the resident (or family, or significant other or guardian, if the resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?” because this question was found to be more effective at eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked. The opt-out mechanism works better than the judgment-about-feasibility approach.
- III.** Accept the pilot study Section Q language changes that were validated in the pilot study.

MDS 3.0 Section Q Proposed Language Pilot Test

Purpose of the Pilot Test

The Minimum Data Set (MDS) is the nursing facility resident assessment instrument used for all nursing facility residents. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) implemented the MDS 3.0 version on October 1, 2010. The revisions to Section Q (Participation in Assessment and Goal Setting) gave CMS an opportunity to improve the identification of individuals in nursing facilities who want to obtain information about available options and supports for community living and to support individual choice. The revisions in version 3.0 were designed to enhance the identification of candidates and strengthen the referral and transition process. Individuals identified for transition to community services in the Section Q process will be referred to local contact agencies to receive information about community choices and for assistance in transitioning to community living situations.

In developing Section Q, CMS convened a work group of 12 volunteer States to provide input on the development of policies, procedures and tools used in transitioning individuals from facilities to community living settings. Many of the recommendations from the Improving Transition Work Group were incorporated into the version of Section Q that is currently in use.

As part of the Section Q implementation process, CMS conducted an open dialog with States, associations and facilities involved in implementing and using Section Q. CMS conducted Open Forum teleconferences, monthly teleconference calls with State Medicaid agencies, discussion sessions at conferences, posting Section Q Implementation Solutions (questions and answers) and State Local Contact Agencies (LCAs) and Points of Contact on the CMS Community Living website, solicited and received questions from users and other stakeholders on the website (www.mdsformedicaid@cms.hhs.gov) and continued its monthly teleconferences with the Improving Transitions Work Group. This open dialog resulted in quick resolution of many implementation issues. It also resulted in several concerns being expressed and suggestions for changing the language and skip patterns in the Section Q items.

Several concerns were heard. Nursing facility providers and families were concerned that the Section Q skip patterns did not adequately accommodate residents with cognitive impairments, Alzheimer's disease, dementia, mental illness or severe behavioral problems. They also expressed concerns that it was difficult to properly involve the family or guardian of residents who are unable to communicate. There was concern by stakeholders that the feasibility of discharge question might exclude many potential candidates being given a choice of transitioning to community living. And there was a need to clarify the issue of making appropriate referrals for residents who want to talk with someone about returning to the community but ultimately decide not to be discharged.

Background

In response to these concerns, CMS project staff and contractors, with the continued assistance of the Improving Transitions Work Group, now augmented with representatives from nursing home associations and State ombudsman programs, worked to develop improved language and skip patterns for Section Q. After several weeks of discussion, a set of new Section Q questions and skip patterns to address the perceived shortcomings in the current version was decided upon. The current version and the proposed version can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.

There were several objectives stated for proposing the changes to Section Q. The intent of the new language is to achieve a better balance between giving individual residents a voice and a choice about the services they receive, while being sensitive to those individuals who may be unable to voice their preferences or be upset by the assessment process. The revised language adopts a more person-centered approach in determining who is asked some of the items in Section Q. The individual resident or their family is placed at the center of decision-making. The new language is designed to be more effective in identifying residents who want to talk with someone about returning to the community, provide more opportunity for the resident (or family/guardian) to get information about transitioning to the community and make choices about a referral to the local contact agency, and be more efficient about who gets queried.

Before making any of the recommended changes to Section Q, CMS wanted to conduct a pilot test of the new items. States and nursing home associations were asked to recruit volunteer nursing facilities to perform the pilot test. Nine facilities were recruited and agreed to perform the pilot test. These were: two facilities in California, two in Massachusetts, two in Michigan, and one each in Alabama, Connecticut and Florida. The pilot test consisted of administering the proposed Section Q items whenever a current MDS 3.0 assessment was normally being conducted. The nursing facility assessors would ask the questions and complete the proposed version for all MDS assessments. The pilot test was conducted from February 1 to February 28, 2011. Pairs of forms (current and proposed) were collected. In addition, each nursing facility assessor completed a survey questionnaire about their experience with the new form and comparing it to the current Section Q items. This survey is attached in Appendix 4. A post-test debriefing of nursing facility assessors was conducted by teleconference on March 7, 2011.

Study Design

The pilot test methodology addressed several issues.

1. Some of the proposed changes were intended to clarify the language in particular items:
 - a. Language was added to item Q500A to improve the clarity. The additions to the existing item are shown in red. “Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond), Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of **leaving this facility and** returning to **live and receive services** the community?”¹

¹ Proposed language changes are indicated in red.

- b. For item Q400A , the current language, “Is there an active discharge plan in place” was replaced with, “**Is active discharge planning already occurring** for the resident to return to the community?”
- 2. Some of the MDS 3.0 pilot test language changes emphasize choices by the individual resident (or their families/significant others) rather than allowing a determination to be made by the nursing facility assessor or care planning team.
 - a. The skip pattern initiated by, “What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?” was eliminated. In the current Section Q, if the determination was made that discharge was not feasible, the resident or family do not get asked the question, “Do you want to talk with someone about the possibility of returning to the community?” Consequently, they did not get presented with a choice of service settings.

In the proposed version, this targeting question was replaced by a more person-centered opt-out question, “Does the resident (or family or significant other or guardian, if the resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again (every quarter) in the future about returning to the community?” This approach maintained the right of choice of the individual resident or family but allowed them to opt out of being asked the question so often (quarterly). They would still be asked the question on annual reviews and a resident retains the right to ask and leave the facility at any time, unless they are a court-ordered placement.

- 3. Item Q0500A, “Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk with someone....” was found to be very confusing by a wide variety of stakeholders, but most importantly nursing facility assessors. This question, part of a skip pattern, was dropped from the proposed version.
- 4. The responses in Item Q0600 were changed to align with the new person-centered approach and to improve the clarity.
 - Q0600. Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?
 - Current version:
 - 0. No – determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.
 - 1. No – referral not made
 - 2. Yes
 - Proposed version:
 - 0. **No – referral not needed**
 - 1. **No – referral is or may be needed** (For more information, see Section Q Care Area Assessment - #20)
 - 2. **Yes – referral made**
- 5. Pilot test facilities also reviewed the Care Area Assessment Return to Community Referral (CAA - 20) to assess its use in the transition planning process.

Study Findings -- Analysis of the Results from the Two Versions

Data from the pairs of forms from eight of the nine facilities were compiled and tabulated.² The aggregated results are shown in Table 1 and Table 2. (The results for each facility are reported in Appendix 3. Comparisons between States or facilities should not be done based on this data).

- Items 1-5: On the two forms, the first five questions were identical; and produced exact or similar percentage responses.
- Item 6: The wording of Q0400A is slightly different (an active discharge plan in place vs. **is active discharge planning already occurring**). The two versions produced the same percentage response. Seventy-eight percent of resident/respondents said no and 22 percent said yes on both forms.
- Item 7: On the current Section Q form, item 7 asks about the determination of feasibility of discharge to the community. Seventy-three percent of the respondents said it was not feasible, 11 percent said discharge was feasible, and 16 percent were uncertain. If the determination was made that discharge was not feasible, the resident or family did not get asked the question, “Do you want to talk with someone about the possibility of returning to the community?” This question, and the resulting skip pattern, was dropped in the proposed version.
- Item 8: On the current version, “Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk with someone about the possibility of returning to the community?” found that 39 percent of respondents said yes, and their previous response was no. Twelve percent said yes, and their previous response had been yes. This question and the resulting skip pattern were dropped in the proposed version.
- Item 9: For the key question (Q0500 B **or A**), “Ask the resident ...” “Do you want to talk with someone about the possibility of **leaving this facility and** returning to **live and receive services in** the community?” there was a major difference in responses between the two versions. On the current Section Q form, 92 percent (87 individuals) indicated no, and 6 percent (6 individuals) said yes, with 2 percent being uncertain. On the proposed version, 76 percent (320 individuals) said no, and 19 percent (80 individuals) said yes, with 5 percent (23 individuals) being uncertain.

The biggest contributor to the difference was in the number of residents or families being asked and responding to the question. Using the current version, because of skip patterns, only 95 individuals were asked and answered the “Do you want to talk to someone...” question. On the proposed version, 423 respondents were asked and answered the question. Eliminating the skip pattern incorporated in the “is discharge feasible” approach resulted in 330 more individuals being asked the question about wanting to talk with someone, and 74 more individuals saying yes.

² Data was incomplete for one facility.

- For the proposed version opt-out question, “Does the resident ... want to be asked again (every quarter) about returning to the community?” 68 percent of respondents (289 individuals) said they did not want to be asked again, and 27 percent (112 individuals) said they did, and for 5 percent (21 individuals) the information was not available.
- Item 10: For the language changes in the responses for the last Section Q question, “Has a referral been made to the local contact agency?” the language changes resulted in about the same number of individuals being referred to local contact agencies (51 vs. 50 individuals).³ The percentage of referrals made was greatly reduced, from 21 percent to 11 percent because, with the change in skip patterns, this question was asked of 230 more individuals. The current and proposed Section Q process resulted in 10 percent of those 503 individuals assessed being referred to the local contact agency.⁴

A number of individuals (55) were identified in the new response category, “1-No, referral is or may be needed.” This new category may be considered as a referral pending category, and was described by an assessor as those individuals who would likely receive a referral when it is time for their discharge.

³ As the two versions were being conducted at the same time, the numbers of referrals were expected to be the same.

⁴ This statistic cannot be generalized to the entire population of nursing facility residents because the sample of residents in this pilot test was not randomly drawn so as to represent the population.

Table 1**Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- All Facilities Combined**

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	119	24
	-Yes	384	76
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	225	44
	-Yes	275	55
	-No family or legally authorized representative	1	1
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	353	70
	-Yes	128	25
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	22	5
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	83	43
	-Expects to remain in this facility	105	54
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	5	3
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	150	77
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	32	16
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	11	6
	-None of the above	1	1
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	385	78
	-Yes	106	22
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	64	16
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	43	11
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	282	73
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	17	17
	-Yes, previous response was no	39	39
	-Yes, previous response was yes	12	12
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	33	33
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	87	92
	-Yes	6	6
	-Unknown or uncertain	2	2
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	112	47
	-No, referral not made	74	31
	-Yes	51	21

Table 2**Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – All Facilities Combined**

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	117	24
	-Yes	372	76
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	215	44
	-Yes	275	56
	-No family or legally authorized representative	2	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	351	71
	-Yes	124	25
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	16	3
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	129	33
	-Expects to remain in this facility	243	62
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	3	1
	-Unknown or uncertain	19	5
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	265	68
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	105	27
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	21	5
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	380	78
	-Yes	105	22
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	320	76
	-Yes	80	19
	-Unknown or uncertain	23	5
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	289	68
	-Yes	112	27
	-Information not available	21	5
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	253	63
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	131	32
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	16	5
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	363	77
	-No, referral is or may be needed	55	12
	-Yes – referral made	50	11

Study Findings -- Analysis of Relationships between Items (Cross-tabulations)

The interrelationships between Section Q item responses were also analyzed. The results of selected cross-tabulations follow.⁵

For the proposed version of Section Q a cross-tabulation of the Q0400 item, “Is active discharge planning occurring...” was made against the Q0500 item, “Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility....” This tabulation revealed that for those respondents which indicated that active discharge planning was not occurring, 55 of them said “Yes, I would like to talk to someone about the possibility of leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community.” See Table 3. This finding reveals an opportunity for those residents without active discharge planning occurring to initiate a contact to return to the community.

Table 3

Proposed Version	Q0400-Is active discharge planning occurring	
Q0500-Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility ...	No	Yes
No	301 (80%)	17
Yes	55 (15%)	24
Unknown or Uncertain	22 (5%)	1
Total	378 (100%)	42

Cross-tabulations were also made for item Q0500, “Do you want to talk to....” and the Referral item (Q0600). Of those 75 respondents that indicated, “Yes, I want to talk to someone...” 10 individuals received referrals to local contact agencies at the time of assessment, for 32 individuals who responded, No-a referral is or may be needed was indicated, and for 33 individuals a response of No-referral not needed was given. See Table 4.

Table 4

Proposed Version	Q0500-Do you want to talk with someone ...		
Q0600-Referral	No	Yes	Unknown or uncertain
No-not needed	288	33	20
No-is or may be needed	15	32	1
Yes-referral made	3	10	0
Total	306	75	21

A cross-tabulation was also made for Q0400 and Q0600. See Table 5. For those 105 individuals where (yes) active discharge planning was occurring, 44 of them received a referral to the local contact agency, for 44 No- referral was not needed was indicated, and 17 had a response of No-referral is or may be needed.

⁵ For all cross-tabulations displayed here, tests for significance were highly significant.

Table 5

Proposed Version	Q0400-Is active discharge planning occurring...	
Q0600-Referral	No	Yes
No-not needed	319	44
No-is or may be needed	39	17
Yes-referral made	2	44
Totals	360	105

A cross-tabulation was made for item Q0300-Overall Expectation (completed at admission only) and item Q0600-Referral. See Table 6. For those indicating (on admission) an overall expectation of being discharged, 44 of them received a referral to the local contact agency. For those expecting to remain in the facility (at admission), 2 individuals received referrals to the local contact agency.

Table 6

Proposed Version	Q0300-Overall expectation			
Q0600-Referral	Expects to be discharged	Expects to remain	Expects discharge to another facility	Unknown or uncertain
No-not needed	40	222	2	9
No-is or may be needed	41	6	0	5
Yes-referral made	44	2	0	0
Total	125	230	2	14

A cross-tabulation was also made for item Q0550A, “Do you want to be asked again...” and Q0550B-the Source (resident, family or significant other, or guardian) of that response. See Table 7. Responses for those individuals responding to the question, “Do you want to be asked again...” were distributed across all categories. A higher proportion of residents (35 percent) indicated that they wanted to be asked again about talking to someone about the possibility of returning to the community than families or guardians.

Table 7

Proposed	Q0550B-Source for Q0550A		
Q0550A- Want to be asked again ...	Resident	Family	Guardian
No	160 (64%)	110 (84%)	15 (75%)
Yes	88 (35%)	19 (15%)	4 (20%)
Info not available	3 (1%)	2 (1%)	1 (5%)
Total	251 (100%)	131 (100%)	20 (100%)

The results in Table 8 appear to validate the hypothesis that there is a difference in applying the new language version and accompanying definitions of item Q0400A. The assessors made a distinction, as intended, between the current version, “Is an active discharge plan in place...” and the proposed version, “Is discharge planning occurring....” There were 16 responses that changed from yes to no, and 12 responses that changed from no to yes. This was a statistically significant difference.

Table 8

Current/Proposed	Q0400A-Is discharge planning occurring..	
Q0400A-Is an active discharge plan in place...?	No	Yes
No	359	12
Yes	16	83
Total	375	95

The results in Table 9 confirm a qualitative finding in the pre-implementation pilot test. The finding was that individual residents/respondents are fairly aware and realistic about their situations. The majority of individuals (88 percent) for whom discharge was determined to be not feasible answered no, they did not want to talk to someone Alternatively, 6 percent of those who were determined to be not feasible did want to talk to someone about returning to the community. As seen in this tabulation, under the proposed version, 17 individuals (6 percent) that would not be asked, using the current form, if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community were asked and did express their choice and said yes under the proposed version.

Table 9

Proposed/Current	Q0400B-Is discharge feasible?		
Q0500-Do you want to talk to someone ...	Determination not made	Is feasible	Not feasible
No	51	7	238 (88%)
Yes	6	25	17 (6%)
Unknown or uncertain	2	1	15 (6%)
Totals	59	33	270 (100%)

Table 10 follows up with the Q0400B-Is discharge feasible issue. For individuals where it was determined that discharge was not feasible, 56 (21 percent) of the individuals said yes, they wanted to be asked again if they want to talk with someone about the possibility of returning to the community. That is a substantial proportion of individuals, who had been determined that discharge was not feasible using the current form, that wanted to reserve their opportunity to exercise their choice of services and settings in the future.

Table 10

Proposed/Current	Q0400B-Is discharge feasible?		
Q0550A-Want to be asked again ...	Determination not made	Is feasible	Not feasible
No	44	8	203 (75%)
Yes	13	22	56 (21%)
Information not available	2	3	11 (4%)
Totals	59	33	270 (100%)

The results of these cross-tabulations support the previous findings that more residents and their families use their right to exercise their choice of wanting to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community under the new proposed language.

Study Findings -- Results of the Nursing Facility Assessor Survey

Another major part of the pilot test was a survey of the nursing facility assessors who participated in the pilot test. A survey instrument was used to obtain their experience and opinions about the proposed version in comparison with the current version. At the end of the pilot test on February 28, 2011, after administering the pair of Section Q forms for a month, the assessors who used the forms were asked to complete the survey form. The survey is attached in Appendix 4.

The results of the assessor surveys are displayed in Table 11. Selected written responses by assessors are shown in italics below.

1. The assessors were asked, In situations where question Q0500A is inappropriate, will the opt-out question (i.e., I don't want to be asked again) address the issue? Seventy-three percent (8 of 11) responded yes.

1). I believe we should continue to ask the questions of all residents, (as their) circumstances may change. 2). You are still asking an inappropriate question. Eliminate the question unless the resident is their own responsible party. 3). If their cognitive status is poor, the family should be addressed.

2. Next the assessors were asked the comparison question, does the Q0550A question, "Does the residentwant to be asked again," work better than the current "discharge is not feasible" approach? The results were about even (6 yes to 5 no).

1). The question lets the resident decide and allows them to reconsider the future. 2). They preferred the discharge not feasible approach because families and patients have unrealistic expectations about going back to the community. 3). It allows them (the resident/family) to make the decision. 4). They still preferred the feasible/not feasible approach without asking the resident if they want to return to the community, (as) some residents are paranoid about the question, feeling the facility wants to discharge them.

3. Asked if the new Q0550B question about the "information source" was necessary or useful in care planning, again the results were about even at 6 to 5.

1). One suggestion was to add an "information not available" response. 2). Two others said it repeats item Q0300B. [This is correct only for the admission assessment. Q0300 is only asked on admission].

4. Assessors were asked about the additional language in Q0500A, does 'leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community?' make it clearer than the current version in use? The results were about even at 5 yes to 4 no.

5. Asked if the new language for item Q0600 (No-referral not needed; No-referral is or may be needed; Yes-referral made) is clearer than the current version, the vast majority (78 percent) indicated it was clearer.

The wording was better, but not great. It only needs to be asked during the discharge assessment when all services are ideally in place.

6. Ninety-one percent (10 of 11) indicated that the time it took to administer the new version was the same as the current Section Q.

It took longer because it allowed for more conversation with resident/family.

7. Forty-five percent indicated that compared to the current Section Q, the new language was easier to understand and communicate to residents, and 55 percent said it was the same. None said it was harder.
8. Asked if the new version was more effective at identifying residents who want to talk with someone about returning to the community, all 11 respondents indicated that it was the same.
9. The survey asked if the new version was more effective at eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community. Almost everyone, 10 of the 11 assessors (91%), indicated that it was more effective.
10. When asked if the new version was more effective at allowing more opportunities for the resident (or family/guardian) to get information about transitioning to the community and make choices about a referral to the local contact agency, all of the 10 assessors responding said it was the same.
11. When asked does the new version provide a better mechanism to not ask the Q0500A (Do you want to talk with someone....) question (on quarterly assessments) if the resident, and/or family/guardian, does not want to be asked the question again, 80 percent (8 of 10) said it was better.

One said that they wanted to continue to ask the question repeatedly to make sure residents do not feel they are being overlooked for opportunities.

12. When asked if using a respondent opt-out mechanism works better than the judgment-about-feasibility approach in the current version, 73% (8 of 11) responded yes.

Some residents and families see this as a difficult question to be asked over and over.

13. All of the respondents reported using the Return to Community Referral Care Area Assessment (CAA 20). Eighty-eight percent reported it being very clear or clear. And the same percent reported it being helpful or very helpful in analyzing problems and in developing a care plan.

Several other open-ended questions were asked of the assessors.

1. Were there difficulties or challenges in asking these questions of the individual, family or significant other?

1). When you ask people who are not competent to make this decision, you are offering false hope, which is emotionally damaging. 2). Time frames for MDS assessments make it difficult to gather resident and family together to discuss discharge. 3). Some families feel they should not have to answer these questions more than once. They get very upset.

2. Are there differences in asking these Section Q items for short-stay versus long-stay residents?

Even long term residents want an opportunity at times to discuss discharge, even though they might not be able to (be discharged).

3. How can we improve the identification of nursing facility residents desiring to return to community living?

1). Through our assessment and interaction with them. 2). Just by continuing to ask if they would like to be discharged. 3). A supportive relationship with the social worker is most effective.

4. Do you have any other suggestions about ways to improve Section Q that were not covered above?

1). Don't ask too many redundant questions. 2). Including clarifying statements in the (Resident Assessment Instrument) Instruction Manual can help the assessor field the myriad of questions from families/residents.

Recommendations

The results of the pilot test provide a strong endorsement for making the changes proposed for Section Q. The specifics are:

1. Eliminate current item Q0400B, "Was determination made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to the community is feasible?"

Eliminating this skip pattern question makes the entire section more person-centered. Removing this judgment about feasibility item resulted in more individuals being asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community and in more individuals saying yes.

2. Eliminate current item Q0500A, "Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk with someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"

This question was confusing to users. Removing this skip pattern question allows more individuals to be asked if they want to return to the community.

3. Add new item Q0550A, “Does the resident (or family, or significant other or guardian, if the resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?”

The resident will still be asked on annual assessments. This new item addressed the issue of some individuals being upset by being asked if they want to return to the community. In the nursing facility assessor survey 91 percent indicated that asking this question was more effective at eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked. And 73 percent of the assessors surveyed said that this opt-out mechanism works better than the judgment about feasibility approach.

4. Add new item Q0550B, “Indicate information source for Q0550A.

This item clarifies for the record and the nursing facility care planning process who responded.

5. Add an additional answer to Q0550B, “4. Information not available.”

This additional response was suggested by one of the pilot test assessors to allow for complete coverage of possible answers.

6. Make the language change proposed for Q0400, “to discharge planning occurring.”

This better conveys the understanding that discharge planning is an ongoing process, not a one-time event. Comparing responses between the current and proposed forms using cross-tabulations, a significant difference in indicated responses was found. Further clarification will be put in the Resident Assessment Instrument Instruction Manual.

7. Make the language change proposed for Q0500, “Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): “Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community?”

The additional language clarifies the question. Five of the assessors indicated that the new language was clearer, four said it was the same and none said it was less clear.

8. Make the proposed changes to the answers in Q0600.

The change will clarify the responses and better relate to the follow-up activities needed.

The current version, “No - determination has been made by the resident and care planning team that contact not required” was somewhat confusing. The proposed version, “No-referral not needed” relates better to item Q0400, “Is active discharge planning already occurring...” It also relates better to the second new response, “No-referral is or may be needed.”

The vast majority of the assessors (78 percent; 7 to 2) indicated that the new language was clearer. The cross-tabulation analysis also demonstrated that there was a distinction to be made by using the new language.

9. Add additional instruction to Q0600, “(document reasons in resident’s chart).”

This will provide additional instruction about documentation of this follow-up activity being required.

10. Promote the use of the Section Q consumer brochure, *Your Right to get Information about Returning to the Community*, for use by nursing facility assessors and care planning teams. The brochure is designed to inform residents and their families of their rights and explain why they are being asked about returning to the community. The brochure can be found at: <http://www.medicare.gov/publications/pubs/pdf/11477.pdf>

Some of the issues raised during the CMS open dialog process surrounding implementation of Section Q have already been addressed in the revisions to the Resident Assessment Instrument (RAI) Instruction Manual due out in May 2011. Several instructions were added to address the issues of individuals being upset by being asked if they want to talk with someone about returning to the community and to address those unable to respond to being interviewed.

Table 11
Nursing Facility Assessor Survey Tabulations

Number	Question / Response	Number/Percent		Number/Percent		Number/Percent	
1	In situations where question Q0500A is inappropriate, will the opt out question address the issue?	Yes		No			
		8	73%	3	27%		
2	Does the Q0550A question, 'Does the residentwant to be asked again,' work better than the current 'discharge is not feasible' approach?						
		6	55%	5	45%		
3	Is the new Q0550B question about the 'information source' necessary or useful in care planning?	Yes		No			
		6	55%	5	45%		
4	Does the addition of the new language (in red below) for Q0500A make it clearer than the current version in use?	Yes		No			
		5	56%	4	44%		
5	Is the new language for item Q0600 (No-referral not needed; No-referral is or may be needed; Yes-referral made) clearer than the current version?	Clearer		Same		Less	
		7	78%	2	22%	0	0
6a	Was the time to administer the new language different from the existing Section Q Items?	Shorter		Same		Longer	
		0	0	10	91%	1	9%
6b	Compared to the current Section Q, was the new language easier to understand and communicate to residents?	Easier		Same		Harder	
		5	45%	6	55%	0	0
7a	Is the new version more effective at identifying residents who want to talk with someone about returning to the community?	More effective		Same		Less	
		0	0	11	100%	0	0
7b	Is the new version more effective at eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community?	More effective		Same		Less	
		10	91%	1	9%	0	0
7c	Is the new version more effective at allowing more opportunities for the resident (or family/guardian) to get information about transitioning to the community and make choices about a referral to the local contact agency?	More effective		Same		Less	
		0	0	10	100%	0	0

Number	Question / Response	Number/Percent		Number/Percent		Number/Percent	
7d	Is the new version more effective at providing a better mechanism to not ask the Q0500A question (on quarterly assessments) if the resident, and/or family/guardian, does not want to be asked the question again?	Better		Same		Worse	
		8	80%	1	10%	1	10%
8	Does this approach, using a respondent opt-out mechanism, work better than the judgment-about-feasibility approach in the current version?	Yes		No			
		8	73%	3	27%		
9	Were there difficulties or challenges in asking these questions of the individual, family or significant other?	Yes		No			
		7	78%	2	22%		
10	Are there differences in asking these Section Q items for short-stay versus long-stay residents?	NA					
11	How can we improve the identification of nursing facility residents desiring to return to community living?	NA					
12	Does your facility use Appendix C - Care Area Assessment 20 (CAA 20) "Return to Community Referral?"	Yes		No			
		7	100%	0	0		
12a	Are the Care Area Assessment #20 Steps in the Process (1-9) clear?	Very clear		Clear		Unclear	
		2	25%	5	63%	1	12%
12b	Was CAA 20 helpful to analyze findings, describe problems and develop a care plan?	Very helpful		Helpful		Not helpful	
		2	22%	5	63%	1	12%
12c	Is CAA 20 easy to use?	Very easy		Easy		Not Easy	
		4	40%	5	50%	1	10%
13	Do you have any other suggestions about ways to improve Section Q that were not covered above?	NA					

Appendix 1
MINIMUM DATA SET (MDS) 3.0
(Current Version)

Section Q

Participation in Assessment and Goal Setting

Q0100. Participation in Assessment

Enter

 Code

A. Resident participated in assessment

- 0. No
- 1. Yes

Enter

 Code

B. Family or significant other participated in assessment

- 0. No
- 1. Yes
- 9. No family or significant other

Enter

 Code

C. Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment

- 0. No
- 1. Yes
- 9. No guardian or legally authorized representative

Q0300. Resident's Overall Expectation

Complete only if A0310F = 1

Enter

 Code

A. Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process.

- 1. Expects to be **discharged to the community**
- 2. Expects to **remain in this facility**
- 3. Expects to be **discharged to another facility/institution**
- 9. **Unknown or uncertain**

Enter

 Code

B. Indicate information source for Q0300A

- 1. **Resident**
- 2. If not resident, then **family or significant other**
- 3. If not resident, family or significant other, then **guardian or legally authorized representative**
- 9. **None of the above**

Q0400. Discharge Plan

Enter

 Code
 Enter

 Code

A. Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes → Skip to Q0600, Referral

B. What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?

- 0. **Determination not made -**
- 1. **Discharge to community** determined is **feasible** – Skip to Q0600
- 2. **Discharge to community** determined is **not feasible** – Skip to next active section

Q0500. Return to Community

Enter

 Code

A. Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?

- 0. No
- 1. Yes – previous response was “no”
- 2. Yes – previous response was “yes” → Skip to Q0600, Referral
- 3. Yes – previous response was “unknown”

Enter

 Code

B. Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): “Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?”

- 0. No
- 1. Yes
- 2. Unknown or uncertain

Q0600. Referral

Enter

 Code

Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?

- 0. No – determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.
- 1. No – referral not made
- 2. Yes

Appendix 2
MINIMUM DATA SET (MDS) 3.0
Proposed Version

Section Q	Participation in Assessment and Goal Setting
Q0100. Participation in Assessment	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	A. Resident participated in assessment 0. No 1. Yes
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	B. Family or significant other participated in assessment 0. No 1. Yes 9. No family or significant other available
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	C. Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment 0. No 1. Yes 9. No guardian or legally authorized representative available
Q0300. Resident's Overall Expectation Complete only if A0310E = 1	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	A. Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process. 1. Expects to be discharged to the community 2. Expects to remain in this facility 3. Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution 9. Unknown or uncertain
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	B. Indicate information source for Q0300A 1. Resident 2. If not resident, then family or significant other 3. If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative
Q0400. Discharge Plan	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	A. Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community? 0. No 1. Yes → Skip to Q0600, Referral
Q0500. Return to Community	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	A. Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community?" 0. No 1. Yes 2. Unknown or uncertain
Q0550. Resident's Preference to Avoid Being Asked Question Q0500A again	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	A. Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community? 0. No --then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments. 1. Yes. 2. Information not available
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	B. Indicate information source for Q0550A 1. Resident 2. If not resident, then family or significant other 3. If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative
Q0600. Referral	
Enter <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Code	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency? 0. No – referral not needed 1. No – referral is or may be needed (For more information See Section Q Care Area Assessment-#20) 2. Yes – referral made

Appendix 3

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- Alabama

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	12	13
	-Yes	76	87
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	8	9
	-Yes	80	91
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	63	72
	-Yes	25	28
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	17	68
	-Expects to remain in this facility	8	32
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	16	64
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	9	36
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	64	73
	-Yes	24	27
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	0	0
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	3	5
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	61	95
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was no	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was yes	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	26	96
	-No, referral not made	1	4
	-Yes	0	0

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Alabama

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	14	17
	-Yes	69	83
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	9	10
	-Yes	77	90
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	61	71
	-Yes	25	29
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	17	40
	-Expects to remain in this facility	24	55
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	2	5
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	18	42
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	25	58
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	70	81
	-Yes	16	19
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	59	68
	-Yes	27	31
	-Unknown or uncertain	1	1
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	73	84
	-Yes	13	15
	-Information not available	1	1
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	47	55
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	39	45
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	87	100
	-No, referral is or may be needed	0	0
	-Yes – referral made	0	0

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations California-1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	29	49
	-Yes	30	51
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	32	55
	-Yes	26	45
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	58	100
	-Yes	0	0
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	9	90
	-Expects to remain in this facility	1	10
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	8	80
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	2	20
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	40	74
	-Yes	14	26
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	6	13
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	8	18
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	31	69
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was no	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was yes	4	50
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	4	50
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	4	80
	-Yes	1	20
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	12	48
	-No, referral not made	9	36
	-Yes	4	16

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – California-1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	28	48
	-Yes	30	52
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	33	57
	-Yes	25	43
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	57	100
	-Yes	0	0
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	9	90
	-Expects to remain in this facility	1	10
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	8	80
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	2	20
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	41	71
	-Yes	17	29
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	34	71
	-Yes	5	10
	-Unknown or uncertain	9	19
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	25	52
	-Yes	13	27
	-Information not available	10	21
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	23	59
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	15	38
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	1	3
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	45	78
	-No, referral is or may be needed	9	15
	-Yes – referral made	4	7

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- Connecticut

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	7	10
	-Yes	67	90
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	71	96
	-Yes	3	4
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	73	97
	-Yes	2	3
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	14	34
	-Expects to remain in this facility	26	63
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	1	2
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	35	83
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	7	17
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	64	96
	-Yes	3	4
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	5	8
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	25	40
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	33	52
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	2	9
	-Yes, previous response was no	17	74
	-Yes, previous response was yes	4	17
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	21	91
	-Yes	2	9
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	9	19
	-No, referral not made	36	75
	-Yes	3	6

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Connecticut

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	7	10
	-Yes	64	90
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	66	93
	-Yes	5	7
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	70	99
	-Yes	1	1
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	31	44
	-Expects to remain in this facility	38	53
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	2	3
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	62	87
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	7	10
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	2	3
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	59	87
	-Yes	9	13
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	35	56
	-Yes	27	44
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	31	50
	-Yes	31	50
	-Information not available	0	0
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	55	90
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	5	9
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	1	1
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	27	43
	-No, referral is or may be needed	27	43
	-Yes – referral made	9	14

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- Florida

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	8	38
	-Yes	13	62
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	12	57
	-Yes	9	43
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	11	52
	-Yes	2	10
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	8	38
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	5	24
	-Expects to remain in this facility	16	76
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	14	67
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	6	28
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	1	5
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	17	81
	-Yes	4	19
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	2	11
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	3	17
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	13	72
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	7	39
	-Yes, previous response was no	9	50
	-Yes, previous response was yes	2	11
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	16	94
	-Yes	1	6
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	16	80
	-No, referral not made	4	20
	-Yes	0	0

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Florida

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	6	32
	-Yes	13	68
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	12	63
	-Yes	7	37
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	11	58
	-Yes	0	0
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	8	42
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	5	26
	-Expects to remain in this facility	14	74
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	13	72
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	5	28
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	15	79
	-Yes	4	21
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	15	88
	-Yes	1	6
	-Unknown or uncertain	1	6
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	14	82
	-Yes	2	12
	-Information not available	1	6
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	12	75
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	4	25
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	14	74
	-No, referral is or may be needed	5	26
	-Yes – referral made	0	0

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations --Massachusetts-1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	20	29
	-Yes	48	71
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	44	65
	-Yes	23	34
	-No family or legally authorized representative	1	1
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	60	88
	-Yes	8	12
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	10	72
	-Expects to remain in this facility	3	21
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	1	7
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	9	64
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	5	36
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	55	80
	-Yes	14	20
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	4	7
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	4	7
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	47	86
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	3	75
	-Yes, previous response was no	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was yes	1	25
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes	1	33
	-Unknown or uncertain	2	67
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	4	18
	-No, referral not made	10	46
	-Yes	8	36

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Massachusetts 1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	17	25
	-Yes	51	75
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	42	62
	-Yes	24	35
	-No family or legally authorized representative	2	3
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	63	93
	-Yes	4	6
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	1	1
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	20	29
	-Expects to remain in this facility	35	52
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	1	1
	-Unknown or uncertain	12	18
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	45	69
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	17	26
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	3	5
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	52	77
	-Yes	16	23
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	37	66
	-Yes	11	20
	-Unknown or uncertain	8	14
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	33	58
	-Yes	15	26
	-Information not available	9	16
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	36	67
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	16	29
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	2	4
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	40	76
	-No, referral is or may be needed	13	24
	-Yes – referral made	0	0

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations Massachusetts 2

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	24	31
	-Yes	54	69
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	22	28
	-Yes	55	71
	-No family or legally authorized representative	1	1
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	50	64
	-Yes	18	23
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	10	13
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	20	95
	-Expects to remain in this facility	1	5
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	18	86
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	2	9
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	1	5
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	40	51
	-Yes	38	48
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	0	0
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	0	0
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	39	100
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was no	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was yes	1	100
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	0	0
	-Yes	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	1	2
	-No, referral not made	2	5
	-Yes	36	93

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Massachusetts 2

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	26	34
	-Yes	50	66
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	18	24
	-Yes	58	76
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	53	70
	-Yes	21	27
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	2	3
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	37	53
	-Expects to remain in this facility	32	46
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	45	64
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	19	27
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	6	9
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	39	54
	-Yes	33	46
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	36	75
	-Yes	9	18
	-Unknown or uncertain	3	6
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	18	39
	-Yes	28	61
	-Information not available	0	0
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	17	39
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	20	45
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	7	16
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	38	51
	-No, referral is or may be needed	1	1
	-Yes – referral made	36	48

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- Michigan-1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	2	4
	-Yes	53	96
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	17	31
	-Yes	38	69
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	15	27
	-Yes	36	65
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	4	7
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	8	15
	-Expects to remain in this facility	47	85
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	45	82
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	0	0
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	10	18
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	47	85
	-Yes	8	15
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	4	9
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	0	0
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	43	91
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	4	100
	-Yes, previous response was no	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was yes	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	0	0
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	4	100
	-Yes	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	12	100
	-No, referral not made	0	0
	-Yes	0	0

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Michigan-1

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	2	4
	-Yes	53	96
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	16	29
	-Yes	39	71
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	14	26
	-Yes	37	67
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	4	7
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	8	15
	-Expects to remain in this facility	47	85
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	45	82
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	0	0
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	10	18
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	47	85
	-Yes	8	15
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	47	100
	-Yes	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	39	83
	-Yes	8	17
	-Information not available	0	0
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	38	81
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	0	0
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	9	19
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	55	100
	-No, referral is or may be needed	0	0
	-Yes – referral made	0	0

Current Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations -- Michigan-2

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	17	28
	-Yes	43	72
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	19	32
	-Yes	41	68
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	23	38
	-Yes	37	62
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	0	0
	-Expects to remain in this facility	3	50
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	3	50
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	5	83
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	1	17
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
	-None of the above	0	0
Q0400A	Is there an active discharge plan in place for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	58	98
	-Yes	1	2
Q0400B	What determination was made by the resident and the care planning team that discharge to community is feasible?		
	-Determination not made	43	74
	-Discharge to community determined is feasible	15	26
	-Discharge to community determined is not feasible	0	0
Q0500A	Has the resident been asked if s/he wants to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?		
	-No	1	2
	-Yes, previous response was no	13	30
	-Yes, previous response was yes	0	0
	-Yes, previous response was unknown	29	67
Q0500B	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	42	98
	-Yes	1	2
	-Unknown or uncertain	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, determination has been made by the resident and the care planning team that contact not required.	32	73
	-No, referral not made	12	27
	-Yes	0	0

Proposed Version MDS 3.0 Section Q Pilot Test Data Tabulations – Michigan-2

Item	Question / Responses	Number	Percent
Q0100A	Resident participated in assessment		
	-No	17	29
	-Yes	42	71
Q0100B	Family or significant other participated in assessment		
	-No	19	32
	-Yes	40	68
	-No family or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0100C	Guardian or legally authorized representative participated in assessment		
	-No	22	37
	-Yes	36	61
	-No guardian or legally authorized representative	1	2
Q0300A	Select one for resident's overall goal established during assessment process		
	-Expects to be discharged to the community	2	3
	-Expects to remain in this facility	52	88
	-Expects to be discharged to another facility/institution	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	5	9
Q0300B	Indicate information source for Q0300A		
	-Resident	29	49
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	30	51
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0400A	Is active discharge planning already occurring for the resident to return to the community?		
	-No	57	97
	-Yes	2	3
Q0500A	Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond): "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community?"		
	-No	57	98
	-Yes	0	0
	-Unknown or uncertain	1	2
Q0550A	Does the resident, (or family or significant other or guardian, if resident is unable to respond) want to be asked again every quarter about returning to the community?		
	-No, then document in resident's chart and do not ask again on future quarterly assessments	56	97
	-Yes	2	3
	-Information not available	0	0
Q0550B	Indicate information source for Q0550A		
	-Resident	25	44
	-If not resident, then family or significant other	32	56
	-If not resident, family or significant other, then guardian or legally authorized representative	0	0
Q0600	Has a referral been made to the Local Contact Agency?		
	-No, referral not needed	57	97
	-No, referral is or may be needed	1	2
	-Yes – referral made	1	2

Appendix 4

Final Nursing Facility MDS Assessor Survey
MDS 3.0 Section Q Participation in Assessment and Goal Setting
Potential Language Change Pilot Test
For February 28, 2011

Name _____

Phone _____

Thank you very much for participating in this pilot test of the proposed language change for Section Q. The information you provide will help CMS improve Section Q and how it operates. We will be asking you about the new proposed language and how it compares to the current Section Q. We are hoping to learn how to make the return to community referral and follow-up process more person-centered and more effectively and efficiently identify individual residents desiring to return to community living.

Please complete this survey immediately after the February 1 through February 28th pilot test is completed. Then transmit it to the CMS contract researcher, Dann Milne, along with the matched pairs of Section Q forms as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS REGARDING SECTION Q TEST LANGUAGE

1. In situations where you feel asking the Q0500A question (on the Pilot Test form) is an inappropriate question, such as for residents with dementia or in terminal hospice care, do you think asking them if they want to opt-out of being asked the question again on the quarterly assessments will address this issue?

Yes/No

IF NO, WHAT WOULD BETTER ADDRESS IT? _____

2. Does the Q0550A question, 'Does the residentwant to be asked again,' work better than the current 'discharge is not feasible' approach? **Yes/No**

COMMENTS: _____

3. Is the new Q0550B question about the 'information source' necessary or useful in care planning? **Yes/No**

COMMENTS: _____

4. Does the addition of the new language (in red below) for Q0500A make it clearer than the current version in use? **Yes/No**

"Ask the resident (or family or significant other if resident is unable to respond), "Do you want to talk to someone about the possibility of leaving this facility and returning to live and receive services in the community?"

Are there ways to improve the clarity of Q0500A? _____

5. Is the new language for item Q0600 (No-referral not needed; No-referral is or may be needed; Yes-referral made) clearer than the current version?

Circle One: **CLEARER -----SAME----- LESS CLEAR**

COMMENTS: _____

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEW PROPOSED SECTION Q LANGUAGE

6. After you got used to using the new set of question
- Was the time to administer the new language different from the existing Section Q Items?
Circle One: **SHORTER-----SAME-----LONGER**
 - Compared to the current Section Q, was the new language easier to understand and communicate to residents?
Circle One: **EASIER -----SAME-----HARDER**
COMMENTS: _____
7. Is the new version more effective at
- Identifying residents who want to talk with someone about returning to the community?
Circle One: **MORE EFFECTIVE -----SAME----- LESS EFFECTIVE**
 - Eliminating those individuals that do not want to be asked if they want to talk to someone about returning to the community?
Circle One: **MORE EFFECTIVE -----SAME----- LESS EFFECTIVE**
 - Allowing more opportunities for the resident (or family/guardian) to get information about transitioning to the community and make choices about a referral to the local contact agency?
Circle One: **MORE -----SAME----- LESS**
 - Providing a better mechanism to not ask the Q0500A question (on quarterly assessments) if the resident, and/or family/guardian, does not want to be asked the question again?
Circle One: **BETTER -----SAME----- WORSE**
8. Does this approach, using a respondent opt-out mechanism, work better than the judgment-about-feasibility approach in the current version? **Yes/No**
COMMENTS: _____
9. Were there difficulties or challenges in asking these questions of the individual, family or significant other?
Yes _____ No _____
What were they? Please describe: _____
10. Are there differences in asking these Section Q items for short-stay versus long-stay residents?

11. How can we improve the identification of nursing facility residents desiring to return to community living?

12. Does your facility use Appendix C - Care Area Assessment 20 (CAA 20) "Return to Community Referral in Attachment 1? **Yes/No**
- Are the CAA 20 Steps in the Process (1-9) clear?
Circle One: **VERY CLEAR ----- CLEAR -----UNCLEAR**
COMMENTS: _____
 - Was CAA 20 helpful to analyze findings, describe problems and develop a care plan?
Circle One: **VERY HELPFUL ----- HELPFUL -----NOT HELPFUL**
 - Does your facility use CAA 20 for Section V documentation? **Yes/No**
 - Is CAA 20 easy to use?
Circle One: **VERY EASY -----EASY-----NOT EASY**
COMMENTS: _____
 - Are there ways to improve CAA 20? Is something missing? What changes should be made?

13. Do you have any other suggestions about ways to improve Section Q that were not covered above?

20. RETURN TO COMMUNITY REFERRAL

Review of Return to Community Referral

From MDS 3.0 RAI MANUAL APPENDIX C Pages C-82-83

Steps in the Process	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Document in the care plan whether the individual indicated a desire to talk to someone about the possibility of returning to the community or not (Q0500B).
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Interview the individual and his or her family to identify potential barriers to transition planning. The care planning/discharge planning team should have additional discussions with the individual and family to develop information that will support the individual's smooth transition to community living.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Other factors to consider regarding the individual's discharge assessment and planning for community supports include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cognitive skills for decision making (C1000) and Cognitive deficits (C0500, C0700-C1000)• Functional/mobility (G0110) or balance (G0300) problems
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Inform the discharge planning team and other facility staff of the individual's choice.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Look at the previous care plans of this individual to identify their previous responses and the issues or barriers they expressed. Consider the individual's overall goals of care and discharge planning from previous items responses (Q0300 and Q0400B). Has the individual indicated that his or her goal is for end-of-life-care (palliative or hospice care)? Or does the individual expect to return home after rehabilitation in your facility?
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Initiate contact with the State-designated local contact agency within 10 business days, and document (Q0600).
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. If the local contact agency does not contact the individual by telephone or in person within 10 business days, make another follow-up call to the designated local contact agency as necessary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Communicate and collaborate with the State-designated local contact agency on the discharge process. Identify and address challenges and barriers facing the individual in their discharge process. Develop solutions to these challenges in the discharge/transition plan.
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Communicate findings and concerns with the facility discharge planning team, the individual's support circle, the individual's physician and the local contact agency in order to facilitate discharge/transition planning.

20. Return to Community Referral

Input from resident and/or family/representative regarding the care area. <u>(Questions/Comments/Concerns/Preferences/Suggestions)</u>		
Analysis of Findings		Care Plan Considerations
Review indicators and supporting documentation, and draw conclusions. Document: . Description of the problem; . Causes and contributing factors; and . Risk factors related to the care area.	Care Plan Y/N	Document reason(s) care plan will/ will not be developed.

Referral(s) to another discipline(s) is warranted (to whom and why):

Information regarding the CAA transferred to the CAA Summary (Section V of the MDS):
☐ Yes ☐ No
